



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

09/684,126

10/06/2000

Thomas R. Hull

10432/31

3216

1333

7590

05/23/2006

PATENT LEGAL STAFF
EASTMAN KODAK COMPANY
343 STATE STREET
ROCHESTER, NY 14650-2201

EXAMINER

TRAN, MYLINH T

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2179

DATE MAILED: 05/23/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/684,126

Applicant(s)

HULL ET AL.

Examiner

Mylinh Tran

Art Unit

2179

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 February 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 56, 59-62, 65-68, 70 and 72-82 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 56, 59-62, 65-68, 70 and 72-82 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Applicant's Amendment filed 02/24/06 has been entered and carefully considered. Claims 56, 59, 62, 65, 68 and 70 have been amended. Claims 76-82 have been added. Claims 57-58, 63-64, 69 and 71 have been deleted. However, the limitations of the amended claims have not been found to be patentable over prior art of record, therefore claims 56, 59-62, 65-68, 70 and 72-82 are rejected under the same ground of rejection as set forth below.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 56, 59-62, 65-68, 70 and 76-82 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Livingston [US. 6,621,590] in view of Habib et al. [US. 5,694,610] and further in view of Coleman et al. [US. 6,262,732].

As per independent claims 56, 62, 68 and 70, Livingston teaches a computer implemented method and corresponding system for controlling through a graphic user interface the printing of a document having one or more pages, wherein each of the plurality of pages has associated therewith a plurality of media and/or finishing attributes, comprising the steps/means: a page representation for each of the plurality of pages (68 and 84 of fig. 3A).

Livingston further teaches a media and/or finishing attributes operator interface operatively coupled to a selected group of the plurality of pages and configured to facilitate at least one of viewing of adding, deleting to, and modifying of the media and/or finishing attributes of the selected group of the plurality of pages (Livingston, 64 and 58 of fig. 3A; col. 5, lines 29-50).

Livingston fails to clearly teach or suggest "the media and/or finishing attributes operator interface operatively coupled to the selected group of the plurality of pages is displayed in response to selections of the page representations for the selected group of the plurality of pages". However, Habib et al. teach the feature at figure 3C, when the operator wishes to view the page features which have been applied to the page (3C04), he/she selects the page by right-click the mouse. Once selected, a menu (3C05) can be viewed of the various available page features for modifying the page (3C04).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to combine the teaching of Habib with Livingston's system. Motivation would have been to enhance the printing pages.

Livingston in view Habib do not disclose the page representations being miniature representations of particular pages as they will look when they are printed and the GUI displays more than one page representation simultaneously. Coleman disclose a plurality of miniature representations of particular pages, as they will look when they are printed, and the GUI displays more than one page representation simultaneously (fig. 2; col. 6, lines 5-15). It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to use the teaching from Coleman of displaying a plurality of miniature representations of particular pages, as they will look when they are printed, and the GUI displays more than one page representation simultaneously in to combine the systems of Livingston in view of Habib. Motivation would have been to allow users quickly to review and to change each individual page's attributes.

As per claim 59, which is dependent claim 56, Livingston fails to clearly teach or suggest "the media and/or finishing attributes operator interface is displayed when the pointing device is manipulated over one of the selected page representations". However, Habib et al. teach the feature at figure 3C, when the operator wishes to view the page features which have been applied to the page (3C04), he/she selects the page by right-click the mouse. Once selected, a menu (3C05) can be viewed of the various available page features for modifying the page (3C04). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to combine the teaching of Habib with Livingston's system.

As per claims 60-61 and 66-67, which are both dependent on claims 56, Livingston does not disclose the media and/or finishing attributes operator interface being comprised of a pull down menu and the media and/or finishing attributes operator interface being comprised of a dialog box. Habib discloses a page setup include a pull down menu and a dialog box (203 of fig. 2). It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to use the teaching from Habib of a page setup include a pull down menu and a dialog box in modified Livingston's system since it would make it easier for users to control the attributes via the pull down menu and dialog box.

As per claim 65, which is dependent on claim 62, it is a similar scope to claim 59; therefore, it should be rejected under similar scope.

As per claims 76 and 79, Livingston teaches or suggests "the media and/or finishing attributes operator interface facilitates viewing of, adding to, and deleting from the media and/or finishing attributes". Livingston fails to clearly teach the step facilitating these above attributes from the selected group of the plurality of pages.

However, Habib et al. teach the feature at figure 3C, when the operator wishes to view the page features which have been applied to the page (3C04), he/she selects the page by right-click the mouse. Once selected, a menu (3C05) can be viewed of the various available page features for modifying the page (3C04). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to combine the teaching of Habib with Livingston's system.

As per claims 77, 80 and 82, Livingston teaches or suggests "the media and/or finishing attributes operator interface facilitates viewing of, adding to, and deleting from and modifying of the media and/or finishing attributes". Livingston fails to clearly

teach the step facilitating these above attributes from the selected group of the plurality of pages.

However, Habib et al. teach the feature at figure 3C, when the operator wishes to view the page features which have been applied to the page (3C04), he/she selects the page by right-click the mouse. Once selected, a menu (3C05) can be viewed of the various available page features for modifying the page (3C04). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to combine the teaching of Habib with Livingston's system.

As per claims 78 and 81, Livingston in view Habib do not disclose the selected group of the plurality of pages including all of the plurality of pages. Coleman disclose the features at fig. 2; col. 6, lines 5-15. It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to use the teaching from Coleman of displaying a plurality of miniature representations of particular pages, as they will look when they are printed, and the GUI displays more than one page representation simultaneously in to combine the systems of Livingston in view of Habib. Motivation would have been to allow users quickly to review and to change each individual page's attributes.

Claims 72-75 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Livingston [US. 6,621,590] in view of Habib et al. [US. 5,694,610] and further in view of Coleman et al. [US. 6,262,732] and further in view of Connors [US 5,600,412].

As per claims 72-75, Livingston in view of Coleman does not disclose the GUI detects conflicts between media and/or finishing attributes and media and/or finishing attributes which are improperly set. Connors discloses that in col. 10, lines 44-47. It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to use the

teaching from Connors of detecting conflicts between media and/or finishing attributes and media and/or finishing attributes which are improperly set in modified Livingston's system since it would allow the system to avoid the inadvertently setting conflicts.

Response to Arguments

Applicant argues that the prior arts do not teach or suggest the operator interface is displayed in response to selections of page representations for the selected group of the plurality of pages. However, while Livingston teaches plurality of pages (figure 3A, 74), Habib et al. teach the feature at figure 3C, when the operator wishes to view the page features which have been applied to the page (3C04), he/she selects the page by right-click the mouse. Once selected, a menu (3C05) can be viewed of the various available page features for modifying the page (3C04). It is clearly that "the operator interface is displayed in response to selections of page representations for the selected group of the plurality of pages" is taught by the systems of Livingston and Habib.

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from

Art Unit: 2179

the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mylinh Tran. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon - Thu from 7:00AM to 3:00PM at 571-272-4141.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Weilun Lo, can be reached at 571-272-4847.

The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are as follows:

571-273-8300

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Mylinh Tran

Art Unit 2179

BA HUYNH
PRIMARY EXAMINER